

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
 AT SEATTLE

JOSEPH RED THUNDER,)	CASE NO. C05-0283-RSL-MAT
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER RE: PENDING
)	MOTIONS AND LETTER
MR. MUNDAY, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff proceeds *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. His motion for reconsideration of the Court's order denying the appointment of counsel (Dkt. 23), motion for extension of time on future filings (Dkt. 20), and a letter requesting a copy of the local court rules (Dkt. 22) are currently before the Court. Having considered the motions and letter, the Court does hereby find and ORDER:

(1) There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under § 1983. Although the Court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), can request counsel to represent a party proceeding *in forma pauperis*, the Court found that plaintiff showed neither exceptional circumstances, nor an inability to articulate his claims *pro se* that would warrant the appointment of counsel. *See Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986). Local Rule 7(h) provides:

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such

01 motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing
02 of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention
earlier with reasonable diligence.

03 CR 7(h)(1). In this case, having considered plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the order
04 denying his motion for counsel, the Court finds no showing of either manifest error or new facts
05 or legal authority. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 23) is DENIED.

06 (2) Plaintiff filed a general motion seeking "an extension of time on future filings of
07 Motions [etc.]" (Dkt. 20.) He notes that he is a prisoner, acting *pro se*, and has very limited
08 access to the library and typing materials. *Id.* While the Court appreciates the difficulties faced
09 by plaintiff, it would not be appropriate to grant a general extension on the timing of his filings.
10 Accordingly, his request for an extension of time is DENIED. However, should plaintiff require
11 additional time with respect to a particular future filing, he should request an extension in relation
12 to that filing.

13 (3) Plaintiff submitted a letter requesting a copy of the local court rules, as well as legal
14 forms he will need to file future motions and special requests. (Dkt. 22.) This Court does not
15 provide copies of court rules or general legal forms. However, the jail law library or county law
16 library should be able to assist plaintiff with this request.

17 (4) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to plaintiff, counsel for defendants, and
18 the Hon. Robert S. Lasnik.

19 DATED this 9th day of June, 2005.

20 
21 Mary Alice Theiler
22 United States Magistrate Judge
23
24
25
26